



QUINCY PLANNING BOARD
Quincy City Hall, 1305 Hancock Street, Quincy, MA 02169
(617) 376-1362 FAX (617) 376-1097
TTY/TDD (617) 376-1375

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman William Geary, Richard Meade, Coleman Barry,
Glen Comiso

MEMBERS ABSENT: Sean Callaghan

OTHERS PRESENT: James J. Fatseas, Interim Planning Director
Margaret Hoffman, Principal Planner
Susan Karim, Assistant Planner

Meeting held in 34 Coddington Street, 1st Floor, Room 121, Quincy, Massachusetts.

Meeting called to order and attendance roll call taken at 7:02 PM by Chairman William Geary.

VOTE TO ACCEPT October 21, 2015 2015 PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

MOTION: by Member Richard Meade to hold approval of the October 21, 2015 Planning Board meeting minutes as written, due to members not present.

SECOND: Member Coleman Barry

VOTE: 4-0 Motion Carries

7:04 PM Public Hearing – 28-34 Chapman Street — Site Plan/Special Permit Planning Board Case No. 2015-47

The Chairman read the Public Hearing notice into record opening the case. He then stated that the Board had received a letter from the Applicant's attorney requesting a continuance of the hearing to the next available Planning Board meeting. There was some discussion amongst Board members regarding the most appropriate date for continuance in consideration of necessary preparedness. Chairman Geary recommended continuing the hearing to the January 27, 2016 Planning Board meeting.

Member Richard Meade made a motion to continue the public hearing to January 27, 2016. Member Glen Comiso seconded the motion and it was so voted unanimously by members present.

Chairman Geary told the audience that the meeting venue needed to be confirmed due to the availability of meeting space and assured the public that the information would be available via the City's publicly posted January 27, 2016 Planning Board meeting agenda. The Chairman then asked if members of the public wished to speak on the matter. 2 members of the public spoke that they wished to submit comment letters regarding the case. The Chairman accepted the letters for submittal into the project record and told the audience that additional comments would be accepted up until the hearing date. Additionally, due to the public interest in the project, he agreed to the City contacting the members of the public who had submitted their comments and wished to attend the continuance.

**7:10 PM Continued Public Hearing – 52 Grafton Street – Site Plan/Special Permit -
Planning Board Case No. 2015-45**

The Chairman read the Public Hearing notice into record and asked the project petitioner to introduce himself. Applicant Chris Pappas spoke about his lifelong Quincy residency and his intimate knowledge of the City, noting that he believed that Quincy was in a development mode, making his proposed development in keeping with the trend. He stated that his proposal was well designed with sensitivity to the character of the neighborhood and that he had met with Jay Duca, Director of Inspectional Services and Planning and Community Development staff in pre-meeting discussions regarding the proposal, with the intention of investing and enhancing the neighborhood. He continued that building up the existing vacant lot would be beneficial to mitigating fire hazards and that the plans had been revised and modified according to review. Chairman Geary asked the project architect to speak, and Mr. Pappas then introduced Gilbert Starkey, AIA, who opined that the vacant space was best utilized as a residential development in keeping with the residential character of the neighborhood. He described the site plans with a visual presentation, including the floor plans for the basement, first and second floors. He also showed elevations of the proposed building stating that the exterior façade would benefit the neighborhood due to the appropriateness of its Colonial architectural design and materiality in keeping with existing homes. Mr. Starkey described an 18,000 square foot building footprint with 36,000 square feet of living area on 2 floors, with a 3rd floor attic for storage only, as well as ample basement level storage space. He said there would be fire and other safety features and that the development of apartments spoke appropriately towards rental housing needs and that the design provided easy ingress and egress accessibility. Planning Board member Coleman Barry asked if the abutting houses were multi-family, to which Mr. Pappas replied that they were predominantly single family homes. Mr. Starkey chimed in that the structures across the street from the site were all multifamily. Planning Board member Richard Meade then asked what the proposed building height was and if it was in keeping with the scale of other neighborhood buildings. Mr. Starkey answered that the building height would be approximately 32 feet and in scale with the varied heights existing buildings. Chairman Geary asked if the multifamily units across the street could be considered average height for the scale of the neighborhood and Mr. Starkey answered yes. Member Barry then asked how long the lot had been vacant to which Mr. Pappas responded that it had never been developed. Mr. Barry expressed concern for parking, inquiring as to how the Applicant could ensure that the proposed 2 parking spaces would be adequate for 4 residential units. Mr. Pappas said guest parking spaces were being considered and assured the Board that not all tenants would be multicar families, but Mr. Barry continued to express his concern of the parking arrangements, to which Mr. Pappas again responded, stating that the snow storage area could provide additional parking on an as-needed basis. Planning Board member Glen Comiso asked if there was street parking available, which Mr. Pappas said was available on the opposite side of the street from the site and insisted that surrounding houses thus far must have successfully negotiated the guest parking issue with occasional street parking, but that most of the time he anticipated that parking would occur on site. Member Meade then asked if there had been a granting of Zoning or other relief, to which Mr. Pappas replied yes – and described the setback relief of the site. Chairman Geary asked if there was adequate frontage to which Mr. Pappas replied yes. Member Comiso asked about landscaping and Mr. Pappas described the use of grass, bushes, and trees with clearance and replacement of existing landscape elements, which he stated had been Ok'd by Park and Forestry Director Christopher Cassani. Member Meade inquired about the date the project would be heard by the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) to which Mr., Pappas replied that it was scheduled for December 8, 2015. Member Comiso asked about the location of the proposed guest parking sport to which Mr., Pappas replied that it would be located 3' feet back from the front of the property. Member Barry asked for an explanation of the turning ratio, which the Applicant's

engineer Michael Joyce explained the logistics for the 9'x18' parking spaces abutted by a 20' aisle. At 7:33pm Mr. Joyce, the project engineer explained the existing conditions and proposed stormwater management system which includes catch basins and onsite infiltration designed to capture 100% with no offsite runoff, as well as new sewer connections to the City system. Chairman Geary asked about the size of the infiltration area, to which Mr. Joyce replied that it would contain 3000 cubic feet of storage set in a stone bed. He went on to explain the proposals for a new sidewalk and the snow storage with heavy snow being removed by a contractor, as well as addressing the concerns of an abutter for sediment control during construction. At 7:37pm Chairman Geary opening the meeting up for public comment on the project, noting the presence of Ward 2 City Councillor Brad Croall and inviting the Councillor to speak to the project. The Councillor stated that he yielded comments to the area residents. Abutter Peter Griswold then spoke, stating that he had living on Glen Way for 23 years and wished to correct the perception of the neighborhood as a multi-family area, as had been previously stated, saying that the neighborhood was populated predominantly by single family homes, the evidence for which he submitted photographs into the record. Mr. Griswold continued stating street parking as his major concern, especially in the winter, addressing potential parking overflow onto Glenwood. He addressed the Applicant's previous statement in which Mr. Pappas expressed concern for the property being vandalized by area youths, questioning that if the Applicant had been so concerned, why hadn't he fenced the property to keep out trespassers? Mr. Griswold additionally shared his concerns for greenspace, snow plowing, and drainage due to the area's history of flooding. There was then some discussion about topographical contours and elevations and how the proposed grading would be addressing them. Abutter James LaPointe from Glenwood Way then expressed his concerns for parking, trash collection, wetlands, flooding, and the sewer system, providing an overview of his concerns using the City's online Assessors Database maps as reference. Mr. Joyce addresses the topographical differences between GIS and the North American onsite survey. Councillor Croall then spoke to his concerns for traffic congestion, parking, and drainage. And there was a brief discussion of the Applicant's request for waiver of Peer Review, and the City's Director of Inspectional Services determining that the City was capable of reviewing the project appropriately without outside consultation. Councillor Croall was then told that the City would provide him drainage calculations submitted by the City Engineer. Member Barry then inquired if the drainage was deemed satisfactory, did the Councillor believe the project proposal was acceptable, to which Mr. Croall responded that he thought the project was too large for the site, referencing a similar proposal from the 1980's which suffered from the same issues. Chairman Geary concluded the discussion by expounding upon parking being a Citywide issue and of continued concern for all Planning Board projects.

Member Richard Meade made a motion to close the Public Hearing.

Member Coleman Barry seconded the motion and it was so vote unanimously.

Chairman Geary then read aloud the comment letter submitted by the City's Traffic Engineer, and Project Planner Margaret Hoffman issued the City's recommendations as follows:

Recommendations

There are several issues regarding the size and amount of parking with this project. The number of units seems to be somewhat dense for the site. We would recommend that the Board discuss the possibilities of reducing the number of units to three and repositioning the structure on the site to allow for additional space for parking. Reducing the number of space required and increasing the amount of space would make for a more desirable project reducing any burdens on the surrounding area.

If the Board were to consider an approval of the project as presented we would recommend that the Applicant submit a landscape plan stamped by a Registered Landscape Architect and a revised site plan showing the location of the eighth parking space. We would also recommend that the following conditions be included as part of that approval:

Conditions

- 1) The applicant shall be required to obtain the necessary variances from the Zoning Board of Appeals.
- 2) The Applicant shall adhere to the requirements of the City's Tree Ordinance.
- 3) The Applicant shall provide a Construction Management Plan to include construction truck routes at least one month prior to the start of construction to the City's Traffic Engineer for review and approval.
- 4) The Stormwater Operation and Maintenance plan shall be recorded at the Norfolk County Registry of Deeds.
- 5) The Applicant shall submit a soil test report for review by the Department of Public Works Engineering Department prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.
- 6) The Applicant shall apply for a Stormwater Connection Permit from the Department of Public Works before construction.
- 7) The applicant shall develop and submit a dust control plan to the Department of Health for review and approval prior to any site activity. Said dust control plan is to be implemented during any site activities to ensure compliance with state air quality regulations.
- 8) The applicant shall submit documentation indicating that construction activities at 52 Grafton Street will not result in rodent issues for abutters. The applicant shall develop a rodent control contingency plan prior to the commencement of construction activities on site which will include the name and contact information for an on-call pest control company. Said rodent control plan shall be developed and submitted to the Department of Health for review and approval prior to any site activity.
- 9) Upon completion of this project, the applicant shall submit to the Planning Board as-built plans showing all utilities, building footprints, reference bounds and benchmarks defining the total site, facilities and right of ways. Plans shall be submitted in a digital format acceptable to the Planning Department.
- 10) The hours for construction activities and delivery of materials will be as follows:
 - 7:00 am to 5:00 pm Monday thru Friday
 - 8:00 am to 4:00 pm Saturday.
 - All construction and deliveries shall be prohibited on Sunday unless a different schedule is approved by the Chief of Police.

Member Barry then asked if the Planning Department had no further issues with drainage, to which Ms. Hoffman replied no. He then asked if a reduction in units was ok with the Planning Department, To which Ms. Hoffman replied yes. Mr. Barry then stated that there were too many unresolved issues to approved the project without further review, to which both Members Meade and Comiso concurred, which then spurred a continued discussion of the issues of concern between the Applicant and members of the Board, until 8:23pm when Chairman Geary made a motion to continue the project until after it has been submitted to and reviewed by the Zoning Board of Appeals. Mr. Pappas then requested to petition for continuing the hearing until January 27, 2016.

**Member Richard Meade made a motion to continue the Public Hearing to January 27, 2016.
Member Glen Comiso seconded the motion and it was so vote unanimously.**

8:26 PM Public Hearing – 8 & 52 Holliston Street & 118 Forest Avenue– Definitive Subdivision – Planning Board Case No. 2015-Subdiv-02

The Chairman read the Notice of Public Hearing to open the case. At 8:28pm he introduced the Applicant's Attorney, Edward Fleming, who gave a brief overview of the project being unusual due to its nature as a subdivision, for which there are very few opportunities left in the City due to densely developed land, and in doing so gave a brief history of the Applicant's previous experience with the development of a subdivision in the 1990's for a project known as Turning Mill Lane. Attorney Fleming provided the historical context for the ownership of the project site and went on to establish the details of the proposal, stating that all elements of compliance with the City's ordinances have been well considered and met. The Attorney gave a description of existing conditions and the proposal's minimal impact. He discussed issues of fire truck turnarounds, roadway widths, and sidewalks, stating that due to late City comment submittals he anticipated the need for a continuance, as well as to address any other outstanding issues of concern as expressed by Denise Valenti and George Goldstein, abutters to the proposed development who vehemently urged the need to consider ADA compliance for sidewalks, overall pedestrian safety issues, snow removal, overdevelopment, and the fear of increased vehicular congestion. Additional abutters who spoke to these same concerns were George Walsh, Mark Joyce, Paul Jackson, Gerard McGrath, and Brian Kelley. At 9:00pm Chairman Geary made a motion to keep the public hearing open. As many neighbors expressed real concerns for the project and complained that they had not been given ample notice of the public hearing, the Chairman ensured that the Planning Department would send Notices of Continuance out to the neighbors so that all interested in attending the continued hearing would be duly informed of the date and time.

**Member Richard Meade made a motion to continue the Public Hearing to January 27, 2016.
Member Coleman Barry seconded the motion and it was so vote unanimously.**

8:49 PM Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) presentation to the Board regarding the City of Quincy Housing Production Plan update.

**9:59PM Member Richard Meade made a motion to close the Public Hearing.
Member Coleman Barry seconded the motion and it was so vote unanimously.**

The Board confirmed that their next Planning Board Meeting would be held on January 13, 2016.

Member Glen Comiso made a motion to adjourn at 10:02 p.m. Member Coleman Barry seconded the motion and it was so voted unanimously.